

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed on May 22, 2006. Upon entrance of the amendments set out above, Claims 20-26 remain pending in this application.

Claims 20-26 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,922. Claims 20-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 20-23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirsh et al. (WO 98/42576). Response is hereby made to these rejections.

Claim 24 was held allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 20-26 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,922. The Examiner did not approve the Terminal Disclaimer filed February 23, 2006 because the attorney who signed the Terminal Disclaimer, is not of record. Enclosed herewith is a new power of Attorney, a new Terminal disclaimer, and a 3.73(b) certification. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the limitation "the carrier" in line 22 lacked antecedent basis. Claim 20 has been amended to provide the missing antecedent basis. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because it was held unclear to what "the second pair" at the end of claim referred. Claim 23

has been amended to make it clear that the pair is the second pair of opposing tools. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the limitations "tool carrier" in line 3 and "the carrier" in line 6 lacked antecedent basis. Claim 25 has been amended to provide the needed antecedent basis. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 20-23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirsh et al. (WO 98/42576). Claim 24 was held allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim 20. Claim 20 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 24. All remaining other pending claims depend from claim 20. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application should be allowed. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned below if it will aid in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted



George R. Corrigan, Reg. No. 34,803  
Corrigan Law Office  
5 Briarcliff Court  
Appleton, WI 54915  
(920) 954-1099